



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MISCELLANY.

NOTARIES SEALS—TAX THEREON—ADHESIVE STAMPS—TAX BILL, SEC. 16, VA. CODE 1904, P. 2198, AND SEC. 589.—There is a widespread disregard on the part of notaries of the law governing tax on seals. Sec. 16 of the Tax Bill provides that when the seal of a notary public is affixed to any paper the notary shall use the adhesive stamp provided for by law at the cost of one dollar each. Sec. 589 of the Code makes the following exceptions, in which cases no adhesive stamp need be attached or tax paid:

1. Documents or papers used in obtaining the benefit of a pension, revolutionary claim, money due on account of military service, or land bounty, under an act of Congress, or under the laws of this or any other State.

2. Seal of notary affixed to affidavit.

3. Seal of notary affixed to deposition.

But in affixing the seal to papers exempt from the operation of the tax, the officer affixing the seal must certify that it is a case in which, by the laws of Virginia, no tax is required upon the seal so affixed, and if the officer makes a false statement that no tax is required, or if he fails to use the adhesive stamp where the tax is required, he is made guilty of a misdemeanor and must be punished by a fine of twenty dollars for each offense. It should also be remembered that unless the notary's seal is superimposed upon the adhesive stamp that it is declared illegal and of no effect and cannot be accepted as a legal notarial seal in any court of this state. *Quære*—When is it necessary or desirable to have any court in *this State* accept a Virginia notarial seal? Is not this last provision "an empty threat?" Sec. 16 of Tax Bill, Va. Code 1904, p. 2198.

OLD VIRGINIA ACTS OF ASSEMBLY.

THE REGISTER desires to complete its set of Virginia Acts, and if any persons have for sale or exchange the following Acts, they can communicate with the editor:

1807-8, 1815-16, 1825-26, 1862, Called Session, Richmond,
 1808-9, 1816-17, 1827-28, 1862, Extra Session, Richmond,
 1809-10, 1819-20, 1829-30, 1862, Wheeling,
 1810-11, 1820-21, 1830-31, 1863,
 1811-12 1821-22, 1831-32, 1863-64, Richmond,
 1812-13, 1822-23, 1832-33, 1861, Wheeling,
 1813-14, 1823-24, 1834-35, 1863-64, Alexandria,
 1814-15, 1824-25, 1835-36, 1864-65, Alexandria,
 1865, Extra Session.

We also have for exchange the following duplicates:

1839-40, 1853-54, 1874-75, 1887-88, 1847-48, 1861, 1877-78, 1901, 1849-50,
 1870-71, 1878-79, 1901-02, 1850-51, 1874, 1887.

VIRGINIA DECISIONS ANNOTATED IN THE AMERICAN REPORTS.—We complete hereunder a feature begun in our December number. We have now given a complete list of Virginia cases annotated in the American Decisions, the American Reports, the American State Reports, the Lawyers' Reports Annotated, and the VIRGINIA LAW REGISTER. In the study of a given case it is obviously of great value to know whether it has been annotated, and, if so, avail one's self of the collection of similar cases found in the notes as well as of the comments of the annotators. The usefulness of the list we have given will be greatly increased if the practitioner will have a reference made in his Virginia Reports on the margin of the page where the case is reported. He may then in using his reports ascertain at a glance whether a case has been annotated in any of the series above enumerated. Any intelligent office boy can mark the reference on the margin of the page and thus greatly increase the value of a set of reports. The editor knows from experience how much labor is thus sometimes saved, when, by a glance at the margin of the page where the case consulted is reported, he is referred to a valuable collection of similar cases or to intelligent comments by such men as Burks, Graves, Lile and Bryan. These various lists will be found in Vol. 10, pp. 750, 840, 1040; Vol. 11, pp. 151, 243, 351. "n" means extensive note.

Manhattan Life Ins. Co. v. Warwick..	20	Gratt.	614	3	Am. Rep.	218
Seig v. Acord.....	21	"	365,	8	"	605
Moses v. Trice.....	21	"	556,	8	"	609
Walker v. Herring.....	21	"	678,	8	"	616
Homestead Cases.....	22	"	266,	12	"	507
Henderlite v. Thurman.....	22	"	466,	12	"	526
Beery v. Irick.....	22	"	484,	12	"	539-n
Newton v. Bushong.....	22	"	628,	12	"	553
Lee v. Murphy.....	22	"	789,	12	"	563
Graeme v. Adams.....	23	"	225,	14	"	130
Ould v. Richmond.....	23	"	464,	14	"	139
Rollo v. Andes Ins. Co.....	23	"	509,	14	"	147
Preston v. Hull.....	23	"	600,	14	"	153
Speer v. Commonwealth.....	23	"	935,	14	"	164
Nash v. Fugate.....	24	"	202,	18	"	640
Burwell v. Lumsden.....	24	"	443,	18	"	648
Mutual B. Life Ins. Co. v. Atwood....	24	"	497,	18	"	652
Twyman v. Hawley.....	24	"	512,	18	"	661
Danville v. Pace	25	"	1,	18	"	663
Continental Ins. Co. v. Kasey	25	"	268,	18	"	681
Bowman v. Miller	25	"	331,	18	"	686
McClintic v. Wise	25	"	448,	18	"	694
Taylor v. Hutchison	25	"	536,	18	"	699
Coleman v. Commonwealth	25	"	865,	18	"	711
Sayers v. Wall	26	"	354,	21	"	303

Hoback v. Kilgore	26	Gratt. 442, 21	Am. Rep.	317
Triplett v. Allen	26	" 721, 21	" "	320
Green v. Phillips	26	" 752, 21	" "	323
Swisher v. Commonwealth	26	" 963, 21	" "	330
Bunting v. Willis	27	" 144, 21	" "	338
Sands v. Lynham	27	" 291, 21	" "	348
Miller v. Fletcher	27	" 403, 21	" "	356
Schwartz v. Commonwealth.....	27	" 1025, 21	" "	365
Royall v. Thomas	28	" 130, 26	" "	335
Barksdale v. White	28	" 224, 26	" "	344
George v. Pilcher	28	" 299, 26	" "	350
Petersburg v. Applegarth	28	" 321, 26	" "	357
Manhattan Fire Ins. Co. v. Weill.....	28	" 389, 26	" "	364-n
Moore v. Virginia F. & M. Ins. Co....	28	" 508, 26	" "	373
Tancil v. Seaton	28	" 601, 26	" "	380
Cecil v. Hicks	26	" 1, 26	" "	391
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co. v. Wightman	29	" 431, 26	" "	384
Chrisman v. Harman	29	" 494, 26	" "	387
Matthews v. Warner	29	" 570, 26	" "	396
Booker v. Booker	29	" 605, 26	" "	401
Herring v. Wickham	29	" 628, 26	" "	405
Whiteacre v. Rector	29	" 714, 26	" "	420
Burch v. Hardwicke	30	" 24, 32	" "	640
Cheatham v. Hatcher	30	" 56, 32	" "	650
Bank of Greensboro v. Chambers	30	" 202, 32	" "	661
Burkholder v. Ludlam	30	" 255, 32	" "	668
Bowler v. Huston	30	" 266, 32	" "	673
Martin v. Lewis	30	" 672, 32	" "	682
Kinney v. Commonwealth	30	" 858, 32	" "	690
Ratliffe v. Anderson	31	" 105, 31	" "	716
Vest v. Michie	31	" 149, 31	" "	722
Noble v. Richmond	31	" 271, 31	" "	726
Woody v. Old Dominion Ins. Co.	31	" 362, 31	" "	732
Sands v. Richmond	31	" 571, 31	" "	742
Frommer v. Richmond	31	" 646, 31	" "	746
Richmond and Danville R. R. V.o. v. Anderson	31	" 812, 31	" "	750
Calhoun v. Williams	32	" 18, 34	" "	759
Grubb v. Sult	32	" 203, 34	" "	765
Gerst v. Jones	32	" 518, 34	" "	773
Nash v. Fugate	32	" 595, 34	" "	780
First Nat. Bank v. Turnbull	32	" 695, 34	" "	791
Hey v. Commonwealth	32	" 946, 34	" "	799
Meredith, Exparte	33	" 119, 36	" "	771
Daingerfield v. Thompson	33	" 136, 36	" "	783
Smith v. City Council	33	" 208, 36	" "	788
Clem v. Holmes	33	" 722, 36	" "	793
Baccigalupo v. Commonwealth	33	" 807, 36	" "	795

Price v. Commonwealth	33	Gratt.	819, 36	Am. Rep.	797
Niemeyer v. Wright	75	Va.	239, 40	" "	720
Wendlinger v. Smith	75	"	309, 40	" "	727
Stonestreet v. Doyle	75	"	356, 40	" "	731
Richmond & Danville R. Co. v. Medley.	75	"	499, 40	" "	734
Pruner v. Pendleton	75	"	516, 40	" "	738
First Nat. Bank v. Paul	75	"	594, 40	" "	740
Alexandria & Fredk. R. R. Co. v. Alex- andria & W. R. R. Co.....	75	"	780, 40	" "	743-n
Law v. Commonwealth.....	75	"	885, 40	" "	750
Borland v. Barrett	76	"	128, 44	" "	152
Hawkins v. Garland	76	"	149, 44	" "	158
Sanderlin v. Baxter	76	"	299, 44	" "	165-n
Keffer v. Grayson	76	"	517, 44	" "	171
Lynchburg Fire Ins. Co. v. West	76	"	575, 44	" "	177
Wilson v. Branck	77	"	65, 46	" "	709
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Reynolds....	77	"	173, 46	" "	715-n
Parsley v. Martin	77	"	376, 46	" "	733
Breeding v. Davis	77	"	639, 46	" "	740
Kirby v. Commonwealth	77	"	681, 46	" "	747
Edwards v. Commonwealth	78	"	39, 49	" "	377
Birch v. Linton	78	"	584, 49	" "	381
Montague v. Allan	78	"	592, 49	" "	384
Dun v. Seaboard etc., R. R.....	78	"	645, 49	" "	388
Clark v. Richmond & Danville R. R. Co.....	78	"	709, 49	" "	398
Moon v. Richmond & A. R. R. Co.....	78	"	745, 49	" "	401-n
Boisseau v. Boisseau	79	"	73, 52	" "	616
Richmond F. & P. R. R. Co. v. Ashby..	79	"	130, 52	" "	620
Louthan v. Commonwealth	79	"	196, 52	" "	626
Harrison v. Commonwealth	79	"	374, 52	" "	634
Foster v. Jones	79	"	642, 52	" "	637
Suffolk v. Parker	79	"	660, 52	" "	640
Tunstall v. Christian	80	"	1, 56	" "	581
Fontaine's Adm ^r . v. Thompson	80	"	229, 56	" "	588
Lynchburg v. Norfolk & Western R. R. Co.....	80	"	237, 56	" "	592
Branch v. Commissioners of Sinking Fund	80	"	427, 56	" "	596
Greenhow v. James	80	"	636, 56	" "	603-n
Benn v. Hatcher	81	"	25, 59	" "	645
Linkenhoker v. Detrick	81	"	44, 59	" "	648
Sheeler v. Chesapeake & Ohio R. R. Co.	81	"	188, 59	" "	654
Harris v. Commonwealth.....	81	"	240, 59	" "	666
Baldwin v. Baldwin	81	"	405, 59	" "	669
Tardy v. Creasy	81	"	553, 59	" "	676-n
Davenport v. Richmond	81	"	636, 59	" "	694